

## Message Text

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 01 STATE 074797  
ORIGIN HA-05

INFO OCT-01 INSE-00 ISO-00 SIG-03 /009 R

DRAFTED BY HA/ORM:JBROH-KAHN:CRH  
APPROVED BY HA/ORM:SCLOWMAN  
INS/CO:TBROBSON

-----095979 230247Z /15

O R 230154Z MAR 78  
FM SECSTATE WASHDC  
TO AMEMBASSY MANILA IMMEDIATE  
INFO AMCONSUL HONG KONG  
AMEMBASSY BANGKOK  
AMEMBASSY KUALA LUMPUR  
AMEMBASSY JAKARTA  
AMEMBASSY SINGAPORE  
USMISSION GENEVA  
AMEMBASSY TOKYO  
AMCONSUL FUKUOKA  
AMCONSUL OSAKA KOBE  
AMEMBASSY TAIPEI  
AMCONSUL MADRAS  
AMEMBASSY SEOUL  
AMCONSUL NAHA  
AMEMBASSY CANBERRA  
AMEMBASSY OTTAWA  
AMEMBASSY WELLINGTON  
AMEMBASSY PARIS  
AMEMBASSY NEW DELHI

UNCLAS STATE 074797

HONG KONG FOR INS DIDIR

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: SREF  
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 STATE 074797

SUBJECT: CLARIFICATION OF IPP-78 PROCEDURES

REF: A. MANILA 4421; B. STATE 38351; C. STATE 68577

1. REF A RAISED QUESTIONS AS TO HOW U.S. CONSIDERATION OF  
PRE-FEBRUARY 1 BOAT REFUGEES TIED IN WITH THEIR WILLINGNESS

TO ACCEPT THIRD COUNTRY RESETTLEMENT AND WITH THEIR REJECTION OR ACCEPTANCE BY THIRD COUNTRIES.

2. REF B INSTRUCTION ON IMPLEMENTATION OF IPP-78 WAS CAREFULLY WORDED AFTER CLOSE CONSULTATION BETWEEN DEPARTMENT AND INS/CO. PARA 7 REF B STATED THAT REFUGEES OTHER THAN THOSE WITH CLOSE RELATIVES IN U.S. WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED FOR IPP-78 UNLESS THEY ARE WILLING TO ACCEPT RESETTLEMENT IN ANY THIRD COUNTRY BUT HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED.

3. KEY POINT HERE IS WILLINGNESS OF REFUGEES OTHER THAN THOSE WITH CLOSE RELATIVES IN U.S. TO ACCEPT RESETTLEMENT ELSEWHERE. AS FOR SECOND POINT ABOUT NOT BEING ACCEPTED BY THIRD COUNTRIES, MANILA SUGGESTED AND DEPARTMENT CONCURRED IN REF C THAT, IF A REFUGEE HAD NOT BEEN ACCEPTED

AFTER ONE MONTH'S CONSIDERATION BY THIRD COUNTRIES, HE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED UNDER IPP-78 AS NOT HAVING BEEN ACCEPTED BY THIRD COUNTRY. FIRST POINT WAS IMPLICIT IN SECOND ONE. IN OTHER WORDS, FOR A REFUGEE TO BE CONSIDERED BY THIRD COUNTRIES FOR A MONTH, HE MUST BE WILLING TO ACCEPT THEIR RESETTLEMENT OFFERS. IF HE IS NOT WILLING TO ACCEPT SUCH OFFERS, THEN OBVIOUSLY NO THIRD COUNTRY WOULD WASTE THE TIME TO CONSIDER HIM.

4. PARA 8 REF B ADDED, AND PARA 2 REF C REPEATED, THAT UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 STATE 074797

IN ORDER TO CLEAR UP BACKLOG OF BOAT REFUGEES, IPP-78 PROCESSING SHOULD BEGIN ASAP FOR ALL THOSE REGISTERED WITH UNHCR REPS BEFORE FEBRUARY 1 BUT THIS DID NOT OVER-RISE KEY POINT IN PARA 7 REF B THAT ALL REFUGEES, EXCEPT THOSE WITH CLOSE RELATIVES IN U.S., MUST AT LEAST BE WILLING TO ACCEPT RESETTLEMENT IN THIRD COUNTRIES BEFORE THEY CAN BE CONSIDERED BY U.S. IN FACT PARA 8 SPECIFICALLY NOTED THAT BEGINNING OF IPP-78 PROCESSING ASAP SHOULD NOT PREEMPT CONSIDERATION BY THIRD COUNTRIES OF PRE-FEBRUARY 1 REFUGEES.

5. THUS WE HAVE FOLLOWING COMMENTS ABOUT POINTS RAISED REF A. EMBASSY INTERPRETATION IN PARA 2 THAT A PRE-FEBRUARY 1 REFUGEE MUST FIRST BE REFERRED TO A THIRD COUNTRY BEFORE HE CAN BE CONSIDERED UNDER IPP-78 IS NOT STRICTLY ACCURATE. ALTHOUGH WE WOULD LIKE REFUGEES WITHOUT CLOSE RELATIVES IN U.S. TO BE REFERRED TO THIRD COUNTRIES, THIS IS NOT A REQUIREMENT FOR PRE-FEBRUARY 1 REFUGEES TO BE CONSIDERED UNDER IPP-78. ONLY REQUIREMENT FOR PRE-FEBRUARY 1 REFUGEES TO BE CONSIDERED BY U.S. IS THAT THEY INDICATE WILLINGNESS TO ACCEPT RESETTLEMENT IN ANY THIRD COUNTRY IF OFFERED, NOT THAT THEIR CASES ACTUALLY

BE REFERRED TO THIRD COUNTRIES.

6. SECONDLY, CONTRARY TO STATEMENT PARA 3 REF A, THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT THAT THE REQUEST OF A PRE-FEBRUARY 1 REFUGEE FOR RESETTLEMENT IN A THIRD COUNTRY BE REJECTED BEFORE HE CAN BE INTERVIEWED BY INS OFFICER. AGAIN, REQUIREMENT IS THAT A PRE-FEBRUARY 1 REFUGEE BE WILLING TO ACCEPT A THIRD COUNTRY OFFER, NOT THAT HIS APPLICATION BE REJECTED.

7. THIS LEADS TO FINAL POINT MADE IN PARA 4 REF A IN WHICH EMBASSY CORRECTLY INTERPRETS INSTRUCTION REF B. ALMOST ALL INDOCHINESE REFUGEES PROBABLY WANT TO COME TO U.S. BUT WE SIMPLY DO NOT HAVE ENOUGH NUMBERS TO HANDLE  
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 04 STATE 074797

THEM AND WE TESTIFIED TO CONGRESS THAT WE WOULD TRY TO GET OTHER COUNTRIES TO SHARE THE LOAD IN ORDER TO OBTAIN CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT FOR OUR PROGRAM, AS SPELLED OUT IN

REF B. THUS IF A BOAT REFUGEE WHO DOES NOT HAVE A CLOSE RELATIVE IN U.S. IS NOT WILLING TO RESETTLE IN A THIRD COUNTRY, HE CANNOT BE CONSIDERED BY U.S. THIS SHOULD BE MADE CLEAR TO REFUGEES AND, WHEREVER THIRD COUNTRY PROGRAMS ARE OPERATING, THEY SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED TO APPLY TO THIRD COUNTRIES SINCE OUR NUMBERS ARE FAST RUNNING OUT. EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH CLOSE RELATIVES IN U.S., WE WILL ONLY CONSIDER PRE-FEBRUARY 1 REFUGEES WILLING TO GO TO THIRD COUNTRIES. SIMILARLY, EXCEPT FOR CLOSE RELATIVES, WE WILL CONSIDER POST-FEBRUARY 1 REFUGEES ONLY IF THEY ARE WILLING TO GO TO THIRD COUNTRIES AND, FOR THOSE IN COUNTRIES WHERE THIRD COUNTRY PROGRAMS ARE OPERATING, ONLY AFTER OTHER COUNTRIES HAVE HAD AT LEAST ONE MONTH TO CONSIDER THEM.

8. EMBASSY NOTES THAT IF THIS REQUIREMENT IS ENFORCED, "THERE WILL BE LITTLE MOVEMENT OF REFUGEES FROM THE PHILIPPINES." DEPARTMENT BELIEVES THAT EMBASSY REFERS TO PREFERENCES OF REFUGEES TO SETTLE IN THE U.S. WE DO NOT BELIEVE THAT MANY REFUGEES WILL PREFER TO REMAIN INDEFINITELY IN THE JOSE FABELLA REFUGEE CENTER RATHER THAN RESETTLING IN FRANCE OR ELSEWHERE. RULE THAT REFUGEE MUST BE WILLING RESETTLE IN THIRD COUNTRIES BEFORE THEY CAN BE CONSIDERED BY U.S. WAS ENFORCED WITHOUT INCIDENT DURING THE EPP. PROBLEM IS FOR EMBASSY TO MAKE CLEAR TO UNHCR REP BLATTER, LOCAL VOLAGS AND REFUGEES THEMSELVES THE REASON FOR THIS RULE AND THE FACT THAT IT WILL BE ENFORCED WITHOUT EXCEPTION. DEPARTMENT CONSIDERS THIS  
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 05 STATE 074797

PRINCIPLE VITAL TO LONG TERM VIABILITY OF THE U.S. PRO-  
GRAM. VANCE

UNCLASSIFIED

NNN

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 01 STATE 074797  
ORIGIN HA-05

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 /018 R

66011

DRAFTED BY HA/ORM:JBROH-KAHN:CRH

APPROVED BY HA/ORM:SCLOWMAN

-----051829 180219Z /75

O 180159Z APR 78

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO AMEMBASSY OSLO IMMEDIATE

UNCLAS STATE 074797

FOL RPT STATE 074797 ACTION MANILA INFO HONG KONG BANGKOK  
KUALA LUMPUR JAKARTA SINGAPORE GENEVA TOKYO FUKUOKA OSAKA  
KOBE TAIPEI MADRAS SEOUL NAHA CANBERRA OTTAWA WELLINGTON  
PARIS NEW DELHI 23 MAR 78 QUOTE

UNCLAS STATE 074797

HONG KONG FOR INS DIDIR

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: SREF

SUBJECT: CLARIFICATION OF IPP-78 PROCEDURES

REF: A. MANILA 4421; B. STATE 38351; C. STATE 68577

1. REF A RAISED QUESTIONS AS TO HOW U.S. CONSIDERATION OF  
PRE-FEBRUARY 1 BOAT REFUGEES TIED IN WITH THEIR WILLINGNESS  
TO ACCEPT THIRD COUNTRY RESETTLEMENT AND WITH THEIR REJEC-  
TION OR ACCEPTANCE BY THIRD COUNTRIES.

2. REF B INSTRUCTION ON IMPLEMENTATION OF IPP-78 WAS CARE-  
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 STATE 074797

FULLY WORDED AFTER CLOSE CONSULTATION BETWEEN DEPARTMENT  
AND INS/CO. PARA 7 REF B STATED THAT REFUGEES OTHER THAN  
THOSE WITH CLOSE RELATIVES IN U.S. WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED  
FOR IPP-78 UNLESS THEY ARE WILLING TO ACCEPT RESETTLEMENT  
IN ANY THIRD COUNTRY BUT HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED.

3. KEY POINT HERE IS WILLINGNESS OF REFUGEES OTHER THAN  
THOSE WITH CLOSE RELATIVES IN U.S. TO ACCEPT RESETTLEMENT  
ELSEWHERE. AS FOR SECOND POINT ABOUT NOT BEING ACCEPTED  
BY THIRD COUNTRIES, MANILA SUGGESTED AND DEPARTMENT CON-  
CURRED IN REF C THAT, IF A REFUGEE HAD NOT BEEN ACCEPTED

AFTER ONE MONTH'S CONSIDERATION BY THIRD COUNTRIES, HE  
SHOULD BE CONSIDERED UNDER IPP-78 AS NOT HAVING BEEN  
ACCEPTED BY THIRD COUNTRY. FIRST POINT WAS IMPLICIT IN  
SECOND ONE. IN OTHER WORDS, FOR A REFUGEE TO BE CON-  
SIDERED BY THIRD COUNTRIES FOR A MONTH, HE MUST BE WILL-  
ING TO ACCEPT THEIR RESETTLEMENT OFFERS. IF HE IS NOT  
WILLING TO ACCEPT SUCH OFFERS, THEN OBVIOUSLY NO THIRD  
COUNTRY WOULD WASTE THE TIME TO CONSIDER HIM.

4. PARA 8 REF B ADDED, AND PARA 2 REF C REPEATED, THAT  
IN ORDER TO CLEAR UP BACKLOG OF BOAT REFUGEES, IPP-78  
PROCESSING SHOULD BEGIN ASAP FOR ALL THOSE REGISTERED  
WITH UNHCR REPS BEFORE FEBRUARY 1 BUT THIS DID NOT OVER-  
RIDE KEY POINT IN PARA 7 REF B THAT ALL REFUGEES, EXCEPT  
THOSE WITH CLOSE RELATIVES IN U.S., MUST AT LEAST BE  
WILLING TO ACCEPT RESETTLEMENT IN THIRD COUNTRIES BEFORE  
THEY CAN BE CONSIDERED BY U.S. IN FACT PARA 8 SPECIFI-  
CALLY NOTED THAT BEGINNING OF IPP-78 PROCESSING ASAP  
SHOULD NOT PREEMPT CONSIDERATION BY THIRD COUNTRIES OF  
PRE-FEBRUARY 1 REFUGEES.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 STATE 074797

5. THUS WE HAVE FOLLOWING COMMENTS ABOUT POINTS RAISED  
REF A. EMBASSY INTERPRETATION IN PARA 2 THAT A PRE-FEB-  
RUARY 1 REFUGEE MUST FIRST BE REFERRED TO A THIRD COUN-  
TRY BEFORE HE CAN BE CONSIDERED UNDER IPP-78 IS NOT  
STRICTLY ACCURATE. ALTHOUGH WE WOULD LIKE REFUGEES WITH-  
OUT CLOSE RELATIVES IN U.S. TO BE REFERRED TO THIRD COUN-  
TRIES, THIS IS NOT A REQUIREMENT FOR PRE-FEBRUARY 1 REFU-

GEES TO BE CONSIDERED UNDER IPP-78. ONLY REQUIREMENT FOR PRE-FEBRUARY 1 REFUGEES TO BE CONSIDERED BY U.S. IS THAT THEY INDICATE WILLINGNESS TO ACCEPT RESETTLEMENT IN ANY THIRD COUNTRY IF OFFERED, NOT THAT THEIR CASES ACTUALLY BE REFERRED TO THIRD COUNTRIES.

6. SECONDLY, CONTRARY TO STATEMENT PARA 3 REF A, THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT THAT THE REQUEST OF A PRE-FEBRUARY 1 REFUGEE FOR RESETTLEMENT IN A THIRD COUNTRY BE REJECTED BEFORE HE CAN BE INTERVIEWED BY INS OFFICER. AGAIN, REQUIREMENT IS THAT A PRE-FEBRUARY 1 REFUGEE BE WILLING TO ACCEPT A THIRD COUNTRY OFFER, NOT THAT HIS APPLICATION BE REJECTED.

7. THIS LEADS TO FINAL POINT MADE IN PARA 4 REF A IN WHICH EMBASSY CORRECTLY INTERPRETS INSTRUCTION REF B. ALMOST ALL INDOCHINESE REFUGEES PROBABLY WANT TO COME TO U.S. BUT WE SIMPLY DO NOT HAVE ENOUGH NUMBERS TO HANDLE THEM AND WE TESTIFIED TO CONGRESS THAT WE WOULD TRY TO GET OTHER COUNTRIES TO SHARE THE LOAD IN ORDER TO OBTAIN CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT FOR OUR PROGRAM, AS SPELLED OUT IN

REF B. THUS IF A BOAT REFUGEE WHO DOES NOT HAVE A CLOSE RELATIVE IN U.S. IS NOT WILLING TO RESETTLE IN A THIRD COUNTRY, HE CANNOT BE CONSIDERED BY U.S. THIS SHOULD BE MADE CLEAR TO REFUGEES AND, WHEREVER THIRD COUNTRY PROGRAMS ARE OPERATING, THEY SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED TO APPLY TO THIRD COUNTRIES SINCE OUR NUMBERS ARE FAST RUNNING OUT. EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH CLOSE RELATIVES IN U.S.,  
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 04 STATE 074797

WE WILL ONLY CONSIDER PRE-FEBRUARY 1 REFUGEES WILLING TO GO TO THIRD COUNTRIES. SIMILARLY, EXCEPT FOR CLOSE RELATIVES, WE WILL CONSIDER POST-FEBRUARY 1 REFUGEES ONLY IF THEY ARE WILLING TO GO TO THIRD COUNTRIES AND, FOR THOSE IN COUNTRIES WHERE THIRD COUNTRY PROGRAMS ARE OPERATING, ONLY AFTER OTHER COUNTRIES HAVE HAD AT LEAST ONE MONTH TO CONSIDER THEM.

8. EMBASSY NOTES THAT IF THIS REQUIREMENT IS ENFORCED, "THERE WILL BE LITTLE MOVEMENT OF REFUGEES FROM THE PHILIPPINES." DEPARTMENT BELIEVES THAT EMBASSY REFERS TO PREFERENCES OF REFUGEES TO SETTLE IN THE U.S. WE DO NOT BELIEVE THAT MANY REFUGEES WILL PREFER TO REMAIN INDEFINITELY IN THE JOSE FABELLA REFUGEE CENTER RATHER THAN RESETTLING IN FRANCE OR ELSEWHERE. RULE THAT REFUGEE MUST BE WILLING RESETTLE IN THIRD COUNTRIES BEFORE THEY CAN BE CONSIDERED BY U.S. WAS ENFORCED WITHOUT INCIDENT DURING THE EPP. PROBLEM IS FOR EMBASSY TO MAKE CLEAR TO UNHCR REP BLATTER, LOCAL VOLAGS AND REFUGEES THEMSELVES

THE REASON FOR THIS RULE AND THE FACT THAT IT WILL BE  
ENFORCED WITHOUT EXCEPTION. DEPARTMENT CONSIDERS THIS  
PRINCIPLE VITAL TO LONG TERM VIABILITY OF THE U.S. PRO-  
GRAM. VANCE

UNQUOTE CHRISTOPHER

UNCLASSIFIED

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 jan 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** POLICIES, REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT, PROGRAMS (PROJECTS)  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 23 mar 1978  
**Decaption Date:** 01 jan 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** n/a  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:**  
**Disposition Date:** 01 jan 1960  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1978STATE074797  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** KAHN:CRH  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** N/A  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Expiration:**  
**Film Number:** D780127-0483  
**Format:** TEL  
**From:** STATE  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1978/newtext/t19780331/aaaabafw.tel  
**Line Count:** 338  
**Litigation Code IDs:**  
**Litigation Codes:**  
**Litigation History:**  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Message ID:** 21b4d7be-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Office:** ORIGIN HA  
**Original Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 7  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** 78 MANILA 4421, 78 STATE 38351, 78 STATE 68577  
**Retention:** 0  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 30 mar 2005  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**SAS ID:** 3223569  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** CLARIFICATION OF IPP-78 PROCEDURES  
**TAGS:** SREF, VM  
**To:** MANILA  
**Type:** TE  
**vdkgvwkey:** odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS\_Docs/21b4d7be-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Review Markings:**  
Sheryl P. Walter  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
20 Mar 2014  
**Markings:** Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014